G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1902-03

(8.7)

File No. 491 of 1902

Serial Nos. 1–4

Papers Filed.

P. 18

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Refund bill in favour of Hanmantha-rayappa, late Sirkar Shanbhog of Kutappanahalli and other villages, Sidlaghatta Taluk.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,

(REVENUE AND GENERAL DEPARTMENTS).

(Full Office Note.)

‡ 1. No. and date of latest letter or paper.
2. Catch words to show nature of subject.
3. Subject to be in red and body of note in black ink.

‡ **Subject.**

A refund bill for Rs 29-8-0 in favour of Hanumanthanarayappa, Shanbog of Kuthappanahalli and Papathimmanahalli, Siddlaghatta Taluk.

(Kolar Dy Comr's no: C700 of 27.10.02)

* 1. Statement of case in narrative form in regular sequence of subject matter or date.
2. Opinions to be stated only as supported by precedents, or general rules which should always be quoted.
3. Serial numbers in file, &c., to be always stated.
4. Dates of important documents referred should be given.
5. Write on both sides, leaving the same side as margin.

* **Note.**

Hanumanthanarayappa enjoyed the following lands as Sarkar Shanbogi Service Inams:—

Papathimmanahalli.

Sur no:	Kind.	Extent.	Assessment
57	wet	0-15	2-8-0
210	Garden	1-12	10-0-0
102	dry	2-20	3-0-0
114	-Do-	2-0	2-4-0
	Total	6-7	17-12-0

Kuthappanahalli

Sur no:	Kind.	Extent.	Assessment
13	dry	3-12	4-0-0
110	-Do-	3-5	4-0-0
	Total	6-17	8-0-0
	Grand total	12-24	25-12-0

Pakka Potgi was settled in the year 1892-93. The full assessment Rs 25-12-0 was brought to book in the accounts as potgi for the 4 years from 1892-93 to 1895-96

Out of the total amount then brought to book, only half the amount Rs 51-8-0 was recovered from the Shanbog as per orders of the Dy Comr, and credited to Govt in 1895-96, the other half having been ordered to be written off the accounts. According to the old pakka Potgi statement subsequently received from the Survey Supdt in October 1896, Rs 4-8-0 for the service Inam lands in Pasupathimanahalli and Re 1-0-0 for those in the other village, was entered in the accounts as due from the Shanbog to Govt. This will amount to Rs 22 only ~~as above~~ for the 4 years in question. But Rs 51-8-0 has been recovered from the Shanbog against 22 Rs actually due by him. The Shanbog claims the refund of the excess amount Rs 29-8-0. Out of this amount, if refunded, he has yet to pay to Govt Rs 3-2-0, being the irrigation cess for the 4 years on his wet and garden lands. The Dy Comr says that the latter sum will be deducted before payment is made, and recommends the refund of the amount claimed.

Submitted for orders.

The words cancelled

15/12/02.

* (not available in the record papers)

with the case have not
been completely received.
The reference quoted
in the Vernacular
Refund bill & the
Dy Comrs' order directing
the recovery of half
the assessment have
not been sent. It
is not clear on what
authority the recovery
was so ordered. From
the title deeds submitted,
the inams appear
to have been settled
as personal inams.
A full report together
with complete refs:
should be called for.

11
16/12/02.

Subd with draft
16.12.02

(Note continued)
The Dy Comr was asked to
report on the above points in this
Office docket no: H996 of 18/12/02.
In reply the Dy Comr submits the
Pakka patgi list and the "Purvani
Thakhta received from the Survey

IX

Superintendent, and reports that the Dy Comrs order directing the recovery of half the assessment referred to is not forthcoming in the Taluk. He refers to endorsement No: 25 of 16.4.95 issued to the petitioner by the ~~Taloobdar~~ Amildar on the authority of the Dy Comrs order, and states that it will be observed therefrom that the petitioner represented his case and wished to have the Inam lands continued on half assessment just as in the case of other Sirkar Inamdars and the Dy Comr ordered the recovery of half the assessment pending the final Settlement of the case in the Inam Department.

A (Vide Sl. No 24 in the ver: file)

Subsequently a quit-rent of Rs 5-8-0 on the aggregate was charged on the Inam (vide extract from the Quit-rent Register) on the authority

(a printed copy of Govt Progs no: 10699/2229 of 7.3.78. 5

(first slip)

The Dy Comm does not say on what authority he ordered the recovery of one half the assessment when full assessment has been brought on the accounts.

PW Ells
Submitted for orders.
25/5/03

The Refund may be allowed.

It is not relevant to find that the Dy Comm's order is not forthcoming

26/5/03

Yes. Let me see draft please

26/5

PW Ells
27/5/03

PW Secretary
Submitted with draft.
28/5/03

29/5/03

4/6/03

Issue

13/6

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
Gl. No.
OCT 31 1902
POLITICAL OFFICE
1902

1258 No. 1

From J. C. Boag Esq
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To H. V. Nanjundayya Esq
Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Dated 27th October 1902

Despatched 30

Received

General No. C. 700
No.

Enclosure No. 10 file

Submitting for sanction a refund bill for Rs. 29-8-0 one in favour of Hanumantha Rayappa Patkar and others.

R.
31.10.1902

Submitted with note.
18/12/02.

No. C. 700

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Camp Bowringpet
Dated 27th October 1902.

From,

J. C. Carr Esqre.
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To,

H. R. Nanjundayya Esqre.
Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, Revenue and
General Departments.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith for sanction a refund bill for Rs. 29. 8. 0 in favor of Hanumanthappa alias Sinkan Shanbogue of Kuttapparahalli and other villages in the Sidlaghatta Taluk under the following circumstances:—

2. Hanumanthanayappa enjoyed the Survey Nos: 57-210-102 and 114 measuring 6A-8G and assessed at Rs: 17. 12—0 in the Papa-Thimmanahalli Village and Survey Nos: 13 and 110 measuring 6A-17G and assessed at Rs: 8/- in the Kuttapparahalli Village of the Sidlaghatta Taluk as Sinkan

17/11/902
8—4—4
25/12/4

2. Pakka Potgi was settled during the year 1892-93. The Taluk authorities erroneously entered the full assessment of the Service Inams i.e. Rs: 25-12-0 as Jodi in the accounts and recovered from the Shanbogue a moiety of the above sum for 4 years from 1892-93 to 1895-96 aggregating Rs: 51-8-0, which were credited to the Treasury

3. The quit rent payable on the Service Inams in both the Villages as settled by the Survey Department is Rs: 5-8-0. This sum should have been recovered from the Shanbogue and credited to the Treasury for the last 4 years, instead of the moiety of the assessment. Hence the excess amount of Rs: 29-8-0 has to be refunded.

4. As the Shanbogue has not paid the irrigation Cess on Garden

and wet lands for the above 4 years at Rs. 12-6 per annum, Rs. 3-2-0 will have to be deducted and adjusted from Rs: 29-8-0 due to him, after the refund is sanctioned.-

5 The Vernacular records endin with the Treasury Officer's Yadi No- 830 dated 20th October 1902 are herein enclosed for reference and obliging return.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner
Kolaba District

Sen 2 ✓

5

To

The Dy Comr,
Kolar dist

No 7L 296

dated 18/12/02

18 Encl 18 File.

The Dy Comrs letter no: C 700 dy 27.10.02 Submitting a refund bill for Rs 29-8-0 in favour of Hanumantharaya s/o of Kuthuffanahalli, Siddlaghatta Taluk:

With reference to the above has the honour to observe that the records connected with the case have not been completely received. The references quoted in the vernacular refund bill and the Dy Comrs order directing the recovery of half the assessment have not been sent. It is not clear on what authority the recovery was

6

So ordered. From the title deeds submitted, the loans appear to have been settled as personal loans. A full report together with complete records may, it is requested, be ~~forwarded to this office for reference~~ expedited. ~~The~~ Enclosures are herewith returned.

"B. A"

~~Draft~~ as per A. A. Shenstone's orders.

16/12/02

for Secy

184

7C 13 R 8

1903

15

FROM [illegible]
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To

The Revenue Branch

a Spare copy of Proceedings

pump

RB.
22/5/03

22/5/03.

To
Hon'ble Ranjitsinhji Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Dated 9th April 1903.

Despatched 8

Received

General No. C-1354
No.

Enclosure No. 19 File

Submitted with continued note.

25/5/03

Furnishing further information re refund of Rs 29-8-0 to Hanumappa of Kulaffanhalli, Siddaghatta Taluk.

Audit
R
14/5/03

File with us

[illegible]

Head Records:—
Please find up G.O
No: 1069-R229 97-3-1878.

24/5/03

Read
5-pm
21/5/03

G.O.

8 Kolar Deputy Commissioner's office.—

No. C. 135/A —Champion Reefs.——

4th April 1903.——

From,

J. B. Carr Esqre.

Deputy Commissioner

Kolar District

To,

N. V. Narajundayya Esqr.

Secretary to the Government

of Mysore Revenue and

General departments.

Sir,

With reference to your docket

No. T.L. 996 dated 18th December 1902

re the refund bill for Rs. 29. 8. —

in favor of Hanumanthanayappa of

Kuttaphunahalli, Siddaghatta Taluk,

I have the honor to submit herewith

for reference, the pakka potgi list

and the Peruvani Jakla received

from the Superintendent of Revenue

Survey in Mysore with yadast Nos.

16 dated 21st January 1893 and 670 dated

2nd October 1896 respectively.

2 The Deputy Commissioner's order

directing the recovery of half the

assessment referred to in the vernacular

refund bill is reported to have not been forthcoming in the Taluk. —

3. But from the endorsement order No- 25 dated 16th April 1895 — issued to the petitioner by the Taluk on the authority of the Deputy Commissioner's order which is filed with the enclosed records, it will be observed that the petitioner seems to have represented his case and wished to have the Inam lands referred to continued on half assessment just as in the case of other Sirkar Shanbogues and the then Deputy Commissioner seems to have ordered the recovery of half the assessment thereon pending the settlement of the Case in the Inam Department. —

4. Subsequently a quit-rent of Rs 5-8-0 on the aggregate was charged on the Inam (Vide Quit Rent Register

in the file) as per Government Proceedings
No. 10697-R229 dated 7th March 1878. — (Spare copy put up)
Hence the excess amount of Rs 29-8
recovered from the petitioner is to be
refunded as per bill resubmitted
herewith for sanction.

5. The records bearing on the subject
are herewith returned. —

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obdt: Servant,

J C Cam
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Sen. 4 !

Read 4

Correspondence ending with letter no: C 1354 dt. 4.03 from the Dy Collr, Kolar District, Submitting a refund bill for Rs 29-8-0 in favour of Hanumantharayappa, late Sirkar Shanbog of Kuthappanahalli and other villages in the Siddlaghatta Taluk.

E.I.A.C.P.

Order thereon No: 2220-1.8 17.6.03.

Hanumantharayappa enjoyed lands as noted in the margin as Sirkar Shanbogi Service Inam. During the year 1892-93, when the remuneration of village officers in the Siddlaghatta Taluk was settled, the full assessment on the said lands was erroneously brought-

× Papathimmanahalli

S.no:	Soil	Extent	Assessment
57	wet	0-15	2-8-0
210	Garden	1-12	10-0-0
102	Dry	2-20	3-0-0
114	-Do-	2-0	2-4-0
		6-7	17-12-0

Kuthappanahalli

13	Dry	3-12	4-0-0
110	-Do-	3-5	4-0-0
		6-17	8-0-0

V charged in
~~brought~~ on the accounts
as jodi, and kept so
for the 4 years from 1892-93
to 1895-96. On the represen-
tation of the party that the
inam lands should be
continued to him on half
the assessment as was done
in the case of other sir-
kar Shanbogs, the Dy
Comr ordered the recovery
of only one half the assess-
ment for the period, the
other half having been
written off the accounts.
A sum of
~~Rs~~ 51-8-0 recovered accord-
ingly was credited to Govt
in the year 1895-96. Sub-
sequently, a quit-rent
of Rs 5-8-0 on the aggre-
gate amount was charged by the
Inam Department. ~~& this only this~~ So the party was
~~amount had to be de-~~
~~covered from~~ the party liable to pay only this
~~for the years~~ sum for each year
~~for year from 1892-93 to 1895-6~~ from 1892-3 to 1895-6.
As Rs 51-8-0 on the whole had already been re-
~~of Rs 29-8-0 in excess of~~ covered, the excess i.e.

Rs 29-8-- has to be paid back & the Dy C~ has ~~forwa~~ sent up a refund bill for sanction.

V3

the amount actually due has been recovered, the party claims the excess amount and the Dy Comr submits a refund bill therefor recommending the claim.

2. The refund bill is sanctioned and forwarded to the Comptroller, Mysore Govt, for Audit.

3. The explanation that the Dy Comr's order directing the recovery of only one half the assessment in the case is missing is not satisfactory; and due notice should be taken of the Conduct of the ~~Dy of Fees~~ Official responsible for the loss.

Sd/- 3/6/3
Sd/- 29/5/03

4. The last Comm~ should have been sent up through the Revs Comm~.

Sd/-

VR 4/6/03

The Dy Comr, Kolar Dist, returning rev: papers.

The Comptroller, Mysore Govt, with the bill.

Sd/- VR 13/6/03